## SUPREME COURT MINUTES THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 2003 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

S100359

G027381 Fourth Appellate District,

**Division Three** 

L. (ROBERT) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)

Opinion filed: Judgment affirmed in full

Majority Opinion By: Moreno, J.

--- joined by George, C. J., Baxter, Werdegar,

Chin, and Brown, JJ

Dissenting Opinion by Kennard, J.

S116408

DAGENHART (SCOTT) ON H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus & stay denied

S024416

PEOPLE v. CLEVELAND AND VEASLEY

Extension of time granted

to August 4, 2003 to appellant CLEVELAND to file appellant's reply brief. After that date, only one further extension totaling 30 additional days will be granted. Extension is granted based upon Assistant State Public Defender Donald J. Ayoob's representation that he anticipates filing that brief by

9/3/2003.

S037625

PEOPLE v. HARRIS (LANELL) Extension of time granted

to August 8, 2003 to file appellant's opening brief. The court anticipates that after that date, only three further extensions totaling 180 additional days will be granted. Counsel is ordered to inform his or her assisting attorney or entity, if any, and any assisting attorney or entity of any separate counsel of record, of this schedule, and to take all steps necessary to meet it.

S064733

PEOPLE v. ABEL (JOHN C.) Extension of time granted

to August 5, 2003 to file appellant's opening brief. The court anticipates that after that date, only three further extensions totaling 180 additional days will be granted. Counsel is ordered to inform his or her assisting attorney or entity, if any, and any assisting attorney or entity of any separate counsel of record, of this schedule, and to take all steps necessary to meet it.

S109537

C039187 Third Appellate District

PEOPLE v. CANTY

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the reply brief on the merits is extended to and including June 28, 2003.

S111985

G028325 Fourth Appellate District,
Division Three

PEOPLE v. PEREZ

Extension of time granted

too July 9, 2003 to file appellant's Answer Brief on the Merits.

S113799

D037761 Fourth Appellate District, Division One ELSNER v. UVEGES (STATE COMPENSATION INSURANCE FUND)

Extension of time granted

On application of respondent Rowdy Elsner and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the Opening Brief on the Merits is extended to and including June 9, 2003.

S116009

C039490 Third Appellate District

CASSIDY v. MURATORE

Extension of time denied

Respondents' application for an extension of time to file the answer to the petition for review is hereby denied.

#### S112443

A095412 First Appellate District, Division Four

#### PEOPLE v. TAYLOR

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Joseph Shipp is hereby appointed to represent appellant on his appeal now pending in this court. Appellant's brief on the merits shall be served and filed on or before thirty (30) days from the date respondent's opening brief on the merits is filed.

S034800

#### PEOPLE v. DEHOYOS (RICHARD L.)

Order filed granting relief from default and extension of time

Good cause appearing, appellant's request for relief from default is granted. Counsel's request for extension of time to file appellant's opening brief is granted to 7/15/2003. The court anticipates that after that date, only three further extensions totaling 180 additional days will be granted. Counsel is ordered to inform his or her assisting attorney or entity, if any, and any separate counsel of record, of this schedule, and to take all steps necessary to meet it.

S113838

### KLUGE ON DISCIPLINE

Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that **DAVID RICHARD** KLUGE, State Bar No. 38800, be suspended from the practice of law for three years, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be actually suspended from the practice of law for two years and until he takes and passes the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination as recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its decision filed on December 9, 2002; and until the State Bar Court grants a motion to terminate his actual suspension pursuant to rule 205 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California; and until he provides proof to the satisfaction of the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to

practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. Respondent is also ordered to comply with the conditions of probation, if any, hereinafter imposed by the State Bar Court as a condition for termination of his actual suspension. It is further ordered that respondent comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7. \*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S113856

## JEFFERS ON DISCIPLINE Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that **THOMAS JOSEPH** JEFFERS, JR., State Bar No. 25453, be suspended from the practice of law for two years and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years on condition that he be actually suspended for 30 days. Thomas Joseph **Jeffers, Jr.** is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed December 26, 2002. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See Segretti v. State Bar (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business & Professions Code

section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7. This order shall be effective on June 1, 2003, or 30 days after the date of this order, whichever is later.

S113874

# COPPOCK ON DISCIPLINE

Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that CHARLES W. COPPOCK, State Bar No. 79458, be suspended from the practice of law for three years and until he provides proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for five years subject to the conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed on January 2, 2003. Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in equal installments for membership years 2004 and 2005.

S113916

## VALINOTI ON DISCIPLINE Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that James Robert Valinoti, State Bar Number 164075, be suspended from the practice of law in the State of California for five years, that execution of the five-year suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for five years on the conditions recommended by the Review Department of the State Bar Court in its opinion filed on December 31, 2002, including the condition that Valinoti be actually suspended from the practice of law in this state for three years and until he shows proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, present fitness to practice, and

present learning and ability in the general law in accordance with standard 1.4(c)(ii) of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct Valinoti is ordered to take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within the period of his actual suspension and to provide satisfactory proof of his passage of that examination to the State Bar's probation unit in Los Angeles within that same period of time. (See Segretti v. State Bar (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Further, Valinoti is ordered to comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court and to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.7.

\*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

TANANA ON DISCIPLINE Recommended discipline imposed

> It is ordered that **THOMAS SCOTT** TANANA, State Bar No. 147892, be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be actually suspended from the practice of law for 30 days, as recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its decision filed on November 22, 2002, as modified by its order filed January 16, 2003; and until the State Bar Court grants a motion to terminate his actual suspension pursuant to rule 205 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California. Thomas Scott Tanana is also ordered to comply with the conditions of probation, if any, hereinafter imposed by the State Bar Court as a condition for terminating his actual suspension. If Thomas Scott Tanana is actually suspended for two years or more, he shall remain actually suspended until he

S114227

provides proof to the satisfaction of the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. It is further ordered that Thomas Scott Tanana take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order or during the period of his actual suspension, whichever is longer. (See Segretti v. State Bar (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) If Thomas Scott **Tanana** is actually suspended for 90 days or more, it is further ordered that he comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 120 and 130 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7. \*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S114230 FRANK ON DISCIPLINE

FRANK ON DISCIPLINE Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that **KEVIN JOSEPH FRANK**, **State Bar No. 119102**, be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for five years subject to the conditions of probation, including six months actual suspension and restitution, recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed on February 6, 2003. It is further ordered that he comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of

this order.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in equal installments for membership years 2004 and 2005

\*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S114232

# FRIEDMAN ON DISCIPLINE Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that **BRUCE MICHAEL** FRIEDMAN, State Bar No. 64095, be suspended from the practice of law for three years and until he provides proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for three years on condition that he be actually suspended for two years and until he complies with standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, as set forth above. Respondent is further ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed on February 7, 2003. It is also ordered that respondent take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination during the period of his actual suspension. (See Segretti v. State Bar (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Respondent is further ordered to comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in equal installments for membership years 2004, 2005 and 2006. \*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S114237

## BOLTE ON DISCIPLINE Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that CARRICK EASTMAN BOLTE, State Bar No. 106986, be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for one year subject to the conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed on February 5, 2003. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See Segretti v. State Bar (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in equal installments for membership years 2004 and 2005.